

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTO	RNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/727,792		12/03/2003	Srikanth T. Srinivasan	42P17888		6794	
8791	7590	11/09/2006		• EXAMINER		INER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN				GEIB, BENJAMIN P			
12400 WILS	SHIRE BO	DULEVARD					
SEVENTH 1	FLOOR				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANGE	LES CA	90025-1030			2181		

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/727,792	SRINIVASAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Benjamin P. Geib	2181		

	benjamin P. Geib	2101	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 23 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, a tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in se with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply n	ffidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the maili	ng date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amoun shortened statutory period for reply ori than three months after the mailing d	t of the fee. The appropr ginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	e filed within two montl	ns of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), t	to avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO	OTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo			
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		•	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ejected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1			(DTOL 004)
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		Alan a lee Clard as as a salar a	ant namenling the
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is profit the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		viii be entered and an e	ехріанаціон от
Claim(s) rejected: 1-30, as set forth in the Final Office Act	tion.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affida	avit or other evidence i	s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under app y and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	hed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	VI Hour	
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:		Jutzm. Hom	•
	•	FRITZ FLEMING	
		ISORY PATENT EXAMI	
	TECH	NOLOGY CENTER 210 リタルいろ	0
		11/8/2006	

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

As to point (a): Claims 10 and 25 have been amended such that they are broader claims than have previously been presented and, therefore, would require further consideration and search. Specifically, the limitation "restoring said set of physical registers", which was present in claims 10 and 25 as examined in Office Action dated 03/28/2006, was removed with the amendment filed 06/02/2006 and has not been added back into the claims in the after final amendment.

As to point (c): Claims 1, 10, 16, and 25 have been amended such that their rejection would be different from that in the Final Office Action. Since the rejection would be different from that of the Final Office Action, the issues would not be reduced or simplified and, therefore, the amendment would not place the application in better form for appeal.

The Examiner notes the amendments would overcome the objection to the drawings set forth in the Final Office Action. .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding claims 1 and 16, the Applicant has argued that Chou in view of Keller and further in view of Roberts does not teach "a first circuit to detect an exact convergence point". In particular, the Applicant argues that the Examiner is incorrect in equating a "first control independent instruction" at taught by Chou with an "exact convergence point". The Examiner notes that, while the Applicant has disclosed exact convergence in the specification, there is no explicit and deliberate definition in the specification of an "exact convergence point". Since there is no explicit and deliberate definition in the specification, the Examiner has given the claim its broadest reasonable interpretation and determined that a first control independent instruction is an exact convergence point. Therefore, since Chou has taught a first circuit to detect a first control independent instruction, Chou has taught a first circuit to detect an exact convergence point.

Regarding claims 2-15 and 17-30, the Examiner notes that the Applicant's arguments are based upon the arguments for claims 1 and 16 and that the reasons given above with regards to claims 1 and 16 apply.